AF
JFW

Docket No.: END920010097US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Patent Application of: Glenn C. Godoy et al

Group Art Unit: 2161	:	IBM Corporation
Examiner: Cam Linh T. Nguyen	:	Intellectual Property Law
Serial No.: 10/042,403	:	Department IQ0A/040-3
Filed: 01/09/2002	:	1701 North Street
Title: COMMON BUSINESS DATA	:	Endicott, New York 13760
MANAGEMENT		

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being deposited with the United States
Postal Service as first class mail in an
envelope addressed to: Commissioner for
Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA
22313-1450, on 09/26/06.

Georgia Y. Brundege   9/26/06

Georgia Y. Brundege   Date

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SECOND REVISED APPEAL BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Appellants hereby submit a second revised appeal brief in
response to a second Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief
dated 08/28/2006.

Appellant believes no additional fee is due. However, if

one is due, the Director is authorized to charge Deposit Account 09-0457.

The Examiner states that Appellant did not show where the limitation of "a relational database" of claim 10 is found. Appellants have revised their appeal brief to specifically repeat the reference to page 7, lines 12 - 15, showing the limitation of a relational database. This reference was stated in the summary of claimed subject matter with regard to claim 1, but is repeated in response to the Examiner's statement.

The Examiner also states that Appellant does not show where the limitation of separate program instruction means of claim 19 is found. Appellants wish to point out that a computer program product for instructing a processor to perform certain steps would inherently have program instruction means as is well known by those of ordinary skill in the art. It is also well established that inherent components of elements recited have antecedent basis in the recitation of the components themselves (MPEP 2173.05(e), line 22). Furthermore, claim 19 was not previously cited for indefiniteness. Consequently, Appellants maintain the recitation of program instruction means in claim 19 is well understood by those of ordinary skill in the art and no support is needed or presented in their Specification. Appellants believe the Board would be able to judge the merits of the arguments presented in this appeal brief without further revision of section (v) SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER with regard to claim 19.

Appellants hereby appeal from the Final Action of

01/03/2005 and the Advisory Action of 03/28/2005, and offer the following arguments in support thereof.

(i) **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party of interest is International Business Machines Corporation, a corporation of New York, with a place of business at Armonk, NY 10504.

(ii) **RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no related appeals or interferences with which the undersigned is aware.

(iii) **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1 - 19 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 - 19 have all been finally rejected and are the subject matter of this appeal.

(iv) **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

An Amendment after the Final Action of 01/03/2005 was filed 03/02/2005. The Examiner's Advisory Action of 03/28/2005 maintains the final rejection, however, for purposes of appeal, the amendment will be entered.

(v) **SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

Appellants' invention relates to a unique method, system,

and program product for maintaining common business data for a
plurality of computer applications. Each application requires
business control date to be set up and maintained in order to
run the application. In many cases, the business control data
required for one application is the same data required by
another application. However, because the computer applications
are separate and usually independently developed and
independently installed, differing solutions are created as part
of each application to perform the same data set up and
maintenance tasks on much of the same data. Consequently,
maintaining and updating control data as it changes is a very
complicated and time consuming task requiring each application
be checked and updated as necessary.

Appellants' claimed subject matter provides a novel
solution to this situation through use of a common database. A
model of business rules which extend across i.e. (that is) span,
a plurality of applications. These rules are built into the
common database. Business control data is entered into this
common database. The appropriate portions of the business
control data is then disseminated to the plurality of
applications according to the business rules.

Specifically, independent claim 1 requires developing a
model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications as
defined in Appellants' Specification page 6, lines 7 - 10, page
7, lines 16 - 20, and FIG. 1, element 110, spanning application
102, 104, 106, and 108. The rules are required to be built into
a common database as defined in page 6, lines 8 - 10, page 7,
lines 12 - 20, and FIG. 1, element 110. In claim 1, business

END920010097US1   10/042,403
                              -4-

control data is also entered into the common database as defined on page 7, line 19 - page 9, line 10. Claim 1 further requires disseminating to the plurality of applications, respective portions of the business control data according to the business rules as defined on page 10, lines 1 - 11, page 11, lines 19 - 21, and FIG. 3, element 304, being propagated to applications 304, 306, 308, and 310.

Independent claim 10 requires a system having elements corresponding to the steps of claim 1 as defined in the respective specification and drawings noted above. In claim 10, the database is required to be a relational database as defined on page 7, lines 12 - 15. Furthermore, structure for disseminating the business control data is further defined on page 12, lines 1 - 4.

Appellants' independent claim 19 requires program instruction means for performing the same steps as those of claim 1 as defined in the respective specification and drawings noted above. Further definition is provided on page 8, line 14, to page 10, line 11, and element 116 of FIG. 1.

(vi) GROUNDS OF REJECTION

There are two grounds of rejection. Claims 1, 6 - 10, and 15 - 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iyengar et al. (US Patent 6,018,627).

Specifically, for independent claims 1, 10, and 19, the Examiner cites Iyengar FIGs. 1 and 7, and column 3, lines 64 -

65, column 4, lines 27 - 33, as describing developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and building the rules into a common database. The Examiner cites Iyengar, FIGs. 7 - 9 and column 9, lines 23 - 48 as describing entering business control data into the common database. The Examiner cites Iyengar column 3, lines 1 - 2, and column 12, lines 35 - 51, as describing disseminating to the plurality of applications, respective portions of the business control data according to the business rules.

Additional parts of Iyengar are cited as describing the requirement of dependent claims 6 - 7, 8 - 9, and 15 - 18.

All of the remaining claims, claims 2 - 5 and 11 - 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iyengar in view of Souder et al. (US Patent 5,724,556).

Regarding this second ground of rejection, for dependent claims 2 - 5 and 11 - 14, the Examiner cites various portions of Souder in combination with Iyengar as describing all of the requirements of these dependent claims. Further detail is not needed because Appellants argue below that all of the independent claims from which these dependent claims depend, are allowable, and therefore all of the dependent claims rejected under this second grounds of rejection, as well as the first grounds of rejection, above, are also allowable.

(vii) ARGUMENT

Claims 1, 6 - 10, and 15 - 19 are patentable under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) over the prior art and, particularly, US Patent 6,018,627 (Iyengar).

Iyengar does not disclose the present invention since, among other things, Iyengar does not disclose developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications as clearly recited in Appellants' independent claims 1 and 19, or a business model having a plurality of applications as recited in independent claim 10. Iyengar describes entities and objects stored in his repository 20, (column 4, lines 28 - 31). However, Iyengar clearly recites a single application, the application under development (column 4, line 29). Furthermore, in column 4, lines 31 - 33, Iyengar gives an example which clearly describes an application (column 4, line 33), i.e., a single application.

Appellants' independent claims 1, 10, and 19 require rules spanning or having a plurality of applications.

Iyengar also describes in column 3, lines 60 - 63, legacy items which may include pre-existing applications. The discovered legacy items may then be transformed into business or object models, or into reusable components. Here, Iyengar uses the plural word "applications." However, there is no description or suggestion that the business or object models resulting from transforming the legacy items are common between individual applications, i.e., span a plurality of applications as required by Appellants' independent claims 1 and 19.

The Examiner's explanation in the Advisory Action of

03/28/2005 states that this claim language of "spanning a plurality of applications" does not suggest that the model of business rules must be common <u>between</u> applications. Appellants respectfully disagree. A common dictionary definition of the word "span" is "to extend across: *a career that spanned 40 years*" See the American Heritage Dictionary, Second College Edition, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1985, p. 1170, third definition. Referring, for example, to Appellants' claim 1, clearly the model of business rules that is developed must span, i.e., extend across, a plurality of applications. Iyengar merely states that the legacy items for each application may be transformed into business or object models. There is no description that these are common between or extend across a plurality of applications. Iyengar therefore fails to anticipate Appellants' invention of independent claims 1, 10, and 19. These claims are allowable.

All of Appellants' other pending claims depend directly or indirectly on these independent claims and therefore also require these features.

Appellants' position therefore is that rejection of the pending claims is in error and must be withdrawn. All of the claims are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Iyengar.

Under the second grounds of rejection, claims 2 - 5 and 11 - 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Iyengar in view of Souder. However, this rejection is moot in view of the arguments above. This rejection must also be withdrawn.

In view of the above, Appellants respectfully request that the Board reverse the Examiner's final rejection of all of the claims on appeal, and allow these claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: __09/25/06__   By: ___John Pivnichny___

John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358
Fax: (607)429-4119

(viii) CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method of updating business control data, comprising the steps of:

developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and building said rules into a common database;

entering business control data into said common database; and

disseminating to said plurality of applications, respective portions of said business control data according to said business rules.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein said rules are built to define a dissemination structure.

3. The method of claim 2, wherein said structure has a plurality of instances of said common database.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein said plurality of instances run on a corresponding plurality of servers located in corresponding geographical locations.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein said geographical locations are in disparate continents.

END920010097US1   10/042,403

-10-

6.   The method of claim 1, wherein said business control data is entered into said common database using a common data administration application.

7.   The method of claim 6, wherein said common data administration application is adapted to receive input from logged on individuals and from an automated feed from a source system.

8.   The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of entering additional rules into said common data administration application.

9.   The method of claim 8, wherein said business control data is entered into said common database according to said additional rules.

10. A system for updating business control data, comprising:

a relational database having rules defining a business model having a plurality of applications;

business control data in said relational database; and

dissemination means coupled to said relational database for disseminating said business control data to said plurality of applications according to said business rules.

11. The system of claim 10, wherein said rules define a dissemination structure.

12. The system of claim 11, wherein said structure has a plurality of instances of said relational database.

13. The system of claim 12, wherein said plurality of instances run on a corresponding plurality of servers located in corresponding geographical locations.

14. The system of claim 13, wherein said geographical locations are in disparate continents.

15. The system of claim 10, further comprising a common data administration application coupled to said relational database for entering said business control data into said relational database.

16. The system of claim 15, wherein said common data

administration application is adapted to receive input from logged on individuals and from an automated feed from a source system.

17. The system of claim 15, further comprising additional rules in said common data administration application.

18. The system of claim 17, wherein said common data administration application is adapted to enter said business control data into said relational database according to said additional rules.

19. A computer program product for instructing a processor to maintain business control data, said computer program product comprising:

a computer readable medium;

first program instruction means for developing a model of business rules spanning a plurality of applications and building said rules into a common database;

second program instruction means for entering business control data into said common database; and

third program instruction means for disseminating to said plurality of applications, respective portions of said business

END920010097US1   10/042,403
-13-

control data according to said business rules; and wherein

all three of said program instruction means are recorded on said medium.

(ix) EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

(x) RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.